


Little Turkey Lake Aquatic Vegetation Management Plan

LaGrange County, Indiana

2007 – 2011



Prepared for:

The Little Turkey Lake Association

3365 S. 1075 E.

LaGrange, Indiana 46761

Prepared by:

Aquatic Weed Control

P. O. Box 325

Syracuse, IN 46567

Executive Summary

The following report outlines a long-term aquatic plant management strategy for Little Turkey Lake. Aquatic Weed Control was contracted by the Little Turkey Lake Association to conduct aquatic vegetation surveys and propose a vegetation management plan based on the results of these surveys. Funding for this plan was provided by the Little Turkey Lake Association and the Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) through the Lake and River Enhancement (LARE) program.

In 2007, Aquatic Weed Control conducted two aquatic vegetation surveys to characterize the plant community of Little Turkey Lake. An early season quantitative survey (Tier II) was conducted on June 14, 2007 and a late season Tier II survey was conducted on August 1, 2007. Each survey followed protocol established by the IDNR to evaluate the health of aquatic plant community

Based on the results of these surveys, as well as interaction with association members, lake users, and IDNR biologists, a management plan was constructed to help reach the three major management goals established by the IDNR for all Indiana public lakes, including those applying for LARE funding. These three goals are listed below.

1. Develop or maintain a stable, diverse aquatic plant community that supports a good balance of predator and prey fish and wildlife species, good water quality and is resistant to minor habitat disturbances and invasive species.
2. Direct efforts to preventing and/or controlling the negative impacts of aquatic invasive species.
3. Provide reasonable public recreational access while minimizing the negative impacts on plant and wildlife resources.

The late season 2007 vegetation survey of Little Turkey Lake found a plant community with above average species diversity (0.85) when compared to area lakes. Eleven different plant species were collected in Little Turkey Lake in the August 2007. Three invasive plant species, Eurasian watermilfoil (*Myriophyllum spicatum*), curly leaf pondweed (*Potamogeton crispus*) and brittle naiad (*Najas minor*) were present in Little Turkey Lake in 2007. Eurasian watermilfoil is of special concern in Little Turkey Lake. This plant species provides poor fish habitat, crowds out beneficial native plant species, and can impair recreation when present in great abundance.

Funding may be awarded by the LARE program in 2008 for herbicide treatments in areas of Eurasian watermilfoil infestation. Chemical treatment options for selective, root control of Eurasian watermilfoil include the following herbicides: Sonar (active ingredient: fluridone), Renovate (active ingredient: triclopyr), and 2, 4-D. Based on past experience, Sonar treatments generally provide the most complete control of Eurasian watermilfoil and can also provide multiple years of control. Renovate and 2, 4-D, while very effective, are normally applied to the same areas on a yearly basis to provide control.

Aquatic Weed Control recommends the use of Sonar to treat Eurasian watermilfoil in Little Turkey Lake because of its widespread distribution. A fluridone treatment has numerous ecological advantages over other herbicides for Eurasian milfoil control. Fluridone will not only kill Eurasian milfoil plants as other herbicides would, but it will also kill its root systems,

reducing the chance for rapid re-growth. One extremely important advantage of using fluridone is that it can selectively kill Eurasian milfoil plants while causing little if any long term harm to native plants. This will allow native plants to re-establish themselves as the Eurasian milfoil population declines.

It is important to note that Eurasian watermilfoil will be the only plant species specifically targeted in this project, as LARE funds will only be awarded for the control of invasive plant species. The goal is not to eliminate vegetation in Little Turkey Lake, but to improve the health of the plant community. Native vegetation will still be abundant in shallow areas after treatment, and control of these natives must be privately funded. The goal will be to reduce the Eurasian watermilfoil population and allow for the recovery of native plant species that will provide better fish habitat, foster good water quality and pose less interference to recreational use of the lake.

Cost estimates for whole lake Sonar treatment are included below. These figures are estimates only and are subject to change pending future chemical pricing.

Project	2008	2009	2010	3 Year Cost Totals
Whole Lake Fluridone Treatment - 6ppb	\$28,100	\$0	\$0	\$28,100
Additional 2 ppb to Control Coontail Additional Cost to Association (Not Eligible for LARE Funding)	\$3,400	\$0	\$0	\$3,400
Follow Up Spot Treatments using 2, 4-D	\$0	\$5,400 If needed	\$5,400	\$10,800
Total Estimated Costs	\$ 31,500	\$ 5,400	\$ 5,400	\$42,300
LARE Share – subject to availability	\$ 25,290	\$ 4,860	\$ 4,860	\$35,010
Association's Share	\$ 6,210	\$ 540	\$ 540	\$7,290

The alternative to a whole lake treatment would be to treat large areas of Little Turkey Lake with 2, 4-D on Renovate herbicide for the control of Eurasian watermilfoil. These treatments are effective, but they would not provide the level of control on a lake wide basis that Sonar would provide. Renovate and 2, 4-D treatments usually do not provide multiple years of control, whereas Sonar can provide multiple years of Eurasian watermilfoil control. Renovate and 2, 4-D treatments would likely have to take place in the same areas year after year to maintain control of Eurasian watermilfoil. Cost estimates for this treatment plan are listed below.

Project	2008	2009	2010	3 Year Cost Totals
Treat up to 45 acres with 2, 4-D	\$16,200	\$16,200	\$16,200	\$48,600
Total Estimated Costs	\$16,200	\$16,200	\$16,200	\$48,600
Total LARE share – subject to availability	\$14,580	\$14,580	\$14,580	\$43,740
Total Association's Share	\$1,620	\$1,620	\$1,620	\$4,860

Acknowledgements

Aquatic vegetation surveys conducted on Little Turkey Lake were made possible by funding from the Little Turkey Lake Association and the Indiana Department of Natural Resources through the Lake and River Enhancement Program. Aquatic Weed Control would like to extend special thanks to Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) District 3 biologist Jed Pearson for providing procedural training for Tier II aquatic vegetation surveys. Gwen White and Angela Sturdevant, aquatic biologists for the IDNR Division of Fish and Wildlife provided valuable consultation regarding the requirements and objectives of this lake management plan. District 2 Fisheries Biologists Neil Ledet and Larry Koza provided consultation for this plan and also provided IDNR survey data. Brad Fink, and Jason Doll provided assistance and training for data analysis computer programs. Aquatic Weed Control would also like to thank the members of the Little Turkey Lake Association for their commitment to improving this lake and for valuable discussion and input brought forward at the informational meeting held on June 30, 2007.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	II
Acknowledgements	IV
Table of Contents	V
List of Figures.....	VII
List of Tables	VIII
1.0 Introduction.....	9
2.0 Watershed and Lake Characteristics.....	10
3.0 Lake Uses	14
4.0 Fisheries Update.....	15
5.0 Problem Statement.....	18
6.0 Management Goals and Objectives	19
7.0 Plant Management History	19
8.0 Aquatic Plant Community Characterization Update.....	21
8.1 Methods.....	21
8.1.2 Tier II	22
8.2 Tier II Results.....	23
8.3 Macrophyte Inventory Discussion.....	28
9.0 Aquatic Plant Management Alternatives.....	29
9.1 No Action	30
9.2 Institutional-Protection of Beneficial Vegetation.....	30
9.3 Environmental Manipulation	30
9.3.1 Water Level Manipulation	30
9.3.2 Nutrient Reduction	31
9.4 Mechanical Controls	31
9.4.1 Mechanical Cutting and Harvesting	31
9.5 Manual Controls	32
9.5.1 Hand Pulling, Cutting, Raking	32
9.5.2 Bottom Barriers	32
9.6 Biological Controls.....	33
9.6.1 Water Milfoil Weevil	33
9.6.2 Grass Carp.....	33

	VI
9.7 Chemical Controls	34
9.7.1 Aquatic Herbicides.....	34
10.0 Public Involvement	34
11.0 Public Education	36
12.0 Integrated Management Action Strategy	39
13.0 Project Budget.....	40
14.0 Monitoring and plan Update Procedures	40
15.0 References.....	42
16.0 Appendices.....	43
16.1 Calculations	43
16.2 Common Aquatic Plants of Indiana.....	45
16.3 Pesticide Use Restrictions Summary:.....	45
16.4 Resources for Aquatic Management	47
16.5 State Regulations for Aquatic Plant Management	48
16.6 Public Questionnaire	49
16.7 Species Distribution Maps.....	50
16.8 Data Sheets	73
16.9 IDNR Vegetation Control Permit.....	81

List of Figures

Figure 1: Little Turkey Lake Shoreline - 2007	10
Figure 2: Little Turkey Lake Land Use	11
Figure 3: Little Turkey Lake Dissolved Oxygen Profile	12
Figure 4: Little Turkey Lake Temperature Profile	13
Figure 5: Little Turkey Lake Public Access Site	14
Figure 6: Little Turkey Lake Wooded Shoreline	14
Figure 7: Little Turkey Lake Eurasian Watermilfoil Bed	18
Figure 8: Little Turkey Lake Rake Sample Locations	23
Figure 9: Little Turkey Lake Coontail Bed	29
Figure 10: 2007 Rake Sample Locations	50
Figure 11: June 2007 Bladderwort Locations	51
Figure 12: June 2007 Brittle Naiad Locations	52
Figure 13: June 2007 Chara Locations	53
Figure 14: June 2007 Coontail Locations	54
Figure 15: June 2007 Curly Leaf Pondweed Locations	55
Figure 16: June 2007 Elodea Locations	56
Figure 17: June 2007 Eurasian Watermilfoil Locations	57
Figure 18: June 2007 Sago Pondweed Locations	58
Figure 19: June 2007 Small Pondweed Locations	59
Figure 20: June 2007 Whorled Watermilfoil Locations	60
Figure 21: August 2007 Bladderwort Locations	61
Figure 22: August 2007 Brittle Naiad Locations	62
Figure 23: August 2007 Chara Locations	63
Figure 24: August 2007 Coontail Locations	64
Figure 25: August 2007 Curly Leaf Pondweed Locations	65
Figure 26: August 2007 Elodea Locations	66
Figure 27: August 2007 Eurasian Watermilfoil Locations	67
Figure 28: August 2007 Flat-Stemmed Pondweed Locations	68
Figure 29: August 2007 Illinois Pondweed Locations	69
Figure 30: August 2007 Sago Pondweed Locations	70
Figure 31: August 2007 Slender Naiad Locations	71
Figure 32: August 2007 Small Pondweed Locations	72

List of Tables

Table 1: Little Turkey Lake LARE History.....	9
Table 2: Fisheries Capture History	15
Table 3: 2003 Fisheries Survey Summary	16
Table 4: Sample Depth by Trophic State.....	22
Table 5: Sample Sites by Lake Size and Trophic State	23
Table 6: June 2007 Data Analysis - Overall	24
Table 7: June 2007 Data Analysis 0 - 5 Feet	24
Table 8: June 2007 Data Analysis 5 - 10 Feet	25
Table 9: August 2007 Data Analysis - Overall.....	25
Table 10: August 2007 Data Analysis 0 - 5 Feet.....	26
Table 11: August 2007 Data Analysis 5 - 10 Feet.....	26
Table 12: 2007 Site Frequencies.....	27
Table 13: 2007 Species Dominance.....	28
Table 14: Public Questionnaire.....	35
Table 15: Future Cost Estimates	40
Table 16: Alternative Management Plan	40
Table 17: Pesticide Use Restrictions.....	46

1.0 Introduction

Aquatic Weed Control was contracted by the Little Turkey Lake Association to develop a long-term aquatic vegetation management plan. Funding for this report was provided by the Little Turkey Lake Association and the Department of Natural Resources through the Lake and River Enhancement (LARE) program.

When a person registers a boat within the state of Indiana a lake enhancement fee is included in the cost of registry. Two thirds of the total proceeds collected from this fee are then used to fund projects designed to improve the quality of Indiana lakes. One third of the total proceeds is set aside for invasive plant control, while one third is set aside for sediment removal and construction projects that benefit Indiana lakes.

The aquatic vegetation surveys included in this report, as well as the management plan, are required by the state to receive funding for the treatment of exotic aquatic vegetation. Should a lake be selected for LARE funding, up to 100,000 dollars can be awarded for a whole lake treatment. Following a whole lake treatment up to 20,000 dollars per year can be awarded for up to 3 years for the maintenance of aquatic invasive plant species. If the whole lake is not treated, up to 20,000 dollars can be available annually for up to three years. Requests for funding are reviewed by the LARE office and funds will be distributed at the discretion of the director of the DNR.

The Little Turkey Lake Association has contracted with Aquatic Weed Control for LARE activities starting in 2007. Prior to this time, no aquatic vegetation management plan had been fully developed. The first LARE funded aquatic vegetation survey conducted by Aquatic Weed Control took place on June 14, 2007. A late season Tier II aquatic vegetation survey was also conducted on August 1, 2007. The following chart summarizes all 2007 LARE funded activities on Little Turkey Lake.

Table 1: Little Turkey Lake LARE History

Year	Action	Date	Funding Source
2007	Spring and Late Season Aquatic Vegetation Surveys as well 2, 4-D application and Management Plan Update	Spring Tier II Survey June 14, 2007	Lake and River Enhancement
		Late Season Tier II Survey August 1, 2007	Little Turkey Lake Association

2.0 Watershed and Lake Characteristics

A feasibility study called the “Big Turkey and Little Turkey Lakes Enhancement Feasibility Study” was completed in 1990 and is an excellent source of information for these lakes. This project was completed by Harza Engineering Company in Chicago, Illinois. It was completed with the help of LARE funding and can be found at the following website:

http://www.in.gov/dnr/fishwild/lare/lare_reports.html


Little Turkey Lake, located in southeastern LaGrange County, has 135 surface acres with a maximum depth of 36 feet and an average depth of 11.5 feet. According to Harza Engineering Hydraulic Retention time is approximately 17 days. Little Turkey Lake was created in the early 1900’s when a cement manufacturer dredged marl from a wetland which is now the lake (Harza, 2003). This dredging could account for the rugged, uneven shoreline in many areas of the lake (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Little Turkey Lake Shoreline - 2007



Little Turkey Lake lies on Turkey Creek, which drains into the Pigeon River. Little Turkey's watershed has an area of 32, 282 acres. In 1990, it was estimated that 20, 831 of these acres were used for crop production. Figure 2 shows 2001 Land Uses around Little Turkey Lake.

Figure 2: Little Turkey Lake Land Use




Secchi disk readings were taken in both surveys by Aquatic Weed Control in 2007. Secchi depth was measured at 3.2 feet in both June and August. Based on these measurements, water clarity is low when compared to many area lakes.

On June 14, 2007 Aquatic Weed Control measured dissolved oxygen and temperature throughout the water column in Little Turkey Lake. This data was used to construct dissolved oxygen and temperature profiles.

Dissolved oxygen requirements to maintain healthy fish populations of warm-water species are at least 2-5 mg of oxygen per liter of water, while cold-water fish species require 5-9 mg of oxygen per liter of water (Kalff, 2002, p237).


In June, Little Turkey Lake already showed strong stratification. Oxygen levels remained constant down to a depth of only 5 feet. After 5 feet, dissolved oxygen dropped rapidly, with almost no oxygen being present in the water column at a depth of 12 feet (Figure 3).

Figure 3: Little Turkey Lake Dissolved Oxygen Profile



The metalimnion is the transition zone between the surface water and the deep water. It is usually accompanied by rapid changes in dissolved oxygen and temperature. The metalimnion in Little Turkey Lake was between 6 and 18 feet, characterized by a loss of dissolved oxygen and a decrease in temperature.

The thermocline is a rapid temperature change associated with the transition from surface water to deep water. In Little Turkey Lake water temperature remains stable from the surface down to 6 feet. Temperature then drops rapidly with depth. This indicates a thermocline beginning at 6 feet (Figure 4).

Figure 4: Little Turkey Lake Temperature Profile

3.0 Lake Uses

Little Turkey Lake receives moderate high levels of public use during the summer months. Little Turkey Lake has an IDNR public access site located on the south shore of the lake just off of county road 350 South. This access site has limited parking (7-9 vehicles) but also adds to the number of boats using the lake. Figure 5 shows the Little Turkey Lake public access site.

Figure 5: Little Turkey Lake Public Access Site



Little Turkey Lake has a 10 mile per hour speed limit, which helps limit excessive boat traffic and excessive speeds. The lake is unique in that only about a third of the lake is developed. The lake has several small islands, and a large section of wooded shoreline, especially in the northeast corner of the lake. These attributes, along with the lake's speed limit make it a very peaceful location for fishing and wildlife viewing. Figure 6 shows a portion of the wooded shoreline of Little Turkey Lake.

Figure 6: Little Turkey Lake Wooded Shoreline



4.0 Fisheries Update

District 2 Fisheries biologists Neil Ledet and Larry Koza provided the most recent fisheries survey information for Little Turkey Lake. Fisheries surveys have been conducted on Little Turkey Lake in 1977, 1985, 1993, and 2003. Table 2 summarizes fish sampling for each of these fisheries surveys.

Table 2: Fisheries Capture History

Historic capture summary for Little Turkey Lake

<u>Species</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>2003</u>
Bluegill	412	658	807	338
Pumpkinseed	166	63	192	141
Bullheads	72	60	28	12
Largemouth bass	57	137	91	129
Warmouth	47	16	16	28
Redear	26	0	23	0
Bowfin	20	3	0	2
Black crappie	17	21	70	62
Lake chubsucker	10	10	3	0
Northern pike	6	2	1	0
Golden shiner	6	0	149	8
Yellow perch	6	9	63	47
Spotted gar	5	13	29	21
Green sunfish	5	3	4	0
White sucker	2	11	67	22
Golden redhorse	2	2	13	4
Carp	0	4	14	3
Other	4	4	19	13
Total	863	1016	1589	830
<u>Sampling effort</u>				
Electrofishing hrs.	1.75	1	0.75	0.75
Gill net lifts	9	9	9	6
Trap net lifts	0	0	6	3

<u>Bluegill</u>				
3 - 5.5 in.	249	378	499	175
6 - 6.5 in.	137	224	142	33
7 - 7.5 in.	14	23	92	39
>= 8 in.	0	0	0	5

<u>Largemouth bass</u>				
8 - 9.5 in.	16	57	14	35
10 - 11.5 in.	4	15	29	39
12 - 13.5 in.	1	15	7	29
14 - 17.5 in.	0	7	5	4
>=18 in.	0	1	0	2

Table 3 summarizes data from the most recent fisheries survey conducted in 2003. Bluegills were the most common species collected in this survey, followed by pumpkinseeds and largemouth bass. Two walleyes were also found in this survey which is likely the result of private stockings.

Table 3: 2003 Fisheries Survey Summary

SPECIES AND RELATIVE ABUNDANCE OF FISHES COLLECTED BY NUMBER AND WEIGHT					
*COMMON NAME OF FISH	NUMBER	PERCENT	LENGTH RANGE (inches)	WEIGHT (pounds)	PERCENT
Bluegill	338	40.7	1.4 - 8.3	25.08	9.9
Pumpkinseed	141	17.0	2.6 - 7.3	17.71	7.0
Largemouth bass	129	15.5	4.8 - 19.0	74.49	29.5
Black crappie	62	7.5	5.3 - 12.5	21.14	8.4
Yellow perch	47	5.7	4.9 - 10.2	9.50	3.8
Warmouth	28	3.4	3.1 - 8.1	6.15	2.4
White sucker	22	2.6	7.0 - 18.2	31.03	12.3
Spotted gar	21	2.5	16.8 - 31.2	28.67	11.3
Yellow bulhead	11	1.3	9.0 - 11.2	6.28	2.5
Hybrid sunfish	10	1.2	3.3 - 7.2	1.45	0.6
Golden shiner	8	1.0	6.3 - 9.2	1.41	0.6
Golden redhorse	4	0.5	12.1 - 17.2	5.03	2.0
Common carp	3	0.4	10.7 - 25.7	9.95	3.9
Bowfin	2	0.2	18.8 - 26.8	8.74	3.5
Walleye	2	0.2	16.9 - 21.2	4.52	1.8
Brown bullhead	1	0.1	13.5	1.03	0.4
Log perch	1	0.1	4.3	0.03	**
Rock bass	1	0.1	8.6	0.40	0.2
Brook silversides	present				
Total (19 Species)	831			252.61	

The following is an excerpt from the 2003 IDNR fisheries report. This is only an excerpt and not the entire report. It summarizes the fish community at Little Turkey Lake. Aquatic Weed Control would like to thank District 2 fisheries biologists Neil Ledet and Larry Koza for providing this information.

“Little Turkey Lake continues to support a satisfactory sport fishery. Bluegill, largemouth bass, black crappie and yellow perch represent the best angling opportunities. Combined these species comprised approximately 78% of the sample by number and 52% by weight. Although bluegill is the dominant species in the lake, the percentage of harvestable size bluegill in the population continues to decline. Only 22.8% of the bluegill collected this year were harvestable size. Largemouth bass numbers appear to have changed very little although the percentage of harvestable size fish has declined from the previous two surveys. Black crappie and yellow perch are not present in large numbers but do contribute to the fishery.

The aquatic plant community at Little Turkey Lake is very diverse. Eurasian water milfoil continues to be a problem in a large portion of the lake. Milfoil weevil was introduced into the lake several years ago in an attempt to determine it's effectiveness in controlling nuisance milfoil. The study is still ongoing and it is unknown when the final results will be available. However, milfoil densities in late July when DFW biologists conducted the plant survey on the lake were lower than those observed in June when the fish survey was conducted.

There is some erosion along the marl banks on the north shore of the lake. This is the only location on the lake where erosion appears to be prevalent.

No fish diseases or parasites were observed during the survey.

No additional fish management is recommended at this time.”

5.0 Problem Statement

Eurasian watermilfoil, curly leaf pondweed and brittle naiad are all exotic species found in Little Turkey Lake. Of these three species Eurasian watermilfoil is many times considered a highest priority when considering funding requests because of its aggressive growth and detrimental effects to the plant community.

In lakes where Eurasian milfoil is left unchecked, well-diversified plant communities can be decimated, although in some lakes native plants compete well with Eurasian watermilfoil. Eurasian milfoil has the ability to “overwinter,” giving it a distinct growth advantage over many native plants. The milfoil lies dormant during the winter months instead of dying back completely, as do many natives. As spring arrives, the dormant milfoil plants have a head start on many native plants and reach the surface faster, shading out the natives. Eurasian milfoil grows profusely, provides poor fish habitat, inhibits boat navigation, and causes annoyances and even recreational hazards to skiers, swimmers, and other members of the public wishing to enjoy the lake.

In Little Turkey Lake, Eurasian watermilfoil is found throughout the lake. Site frequency was 36.0% in June of 2007, and 24.0% in August of 2007. The heaviest areas of infestation are near shore, as plants were only found to a depth of 8 to 9 feet in 2007. Eurasian watermilfoil forms very dense beds in many areas of Little Turkey Lake. Figure 7 shows a dense Eurasian watermilfoil bed in Little Turkey Lake.

Figure 7: Little Turkey Lake Eurasian Watermilfoil Bed



6.0 Management Goals and Objectives

The following management goals have been established by the IDNR for all Indiana lakes, including those applying for LARE funding. Any management practices implemented on Little Turkey Lake are to directly facilitate the achievement of these three goals:

1. Develop or maintain a stable, diverse aquatic plant community that supports a good balance of predator and prey fish and wildlife species, good water quality and is resistant to minor habitat disturbances and invasive species.
2. Direct efforts to preventing and/or controlling the negative impacts of aquatic invasive species.
3. Provide reasonable public recreational access while minimizing the negative impacts on plant and wildlife resources.

Specific Objectives:

Specific objectives are needed to ensure that the fundamental goals of the LARE program are met. The following steps are recommended to help achieve LARE management goals for Little Turkey Lake.

1. **Areas infested with Eurasian watermilfoil should be treated with herbicides.** Aquatic Weed Control recommends that the whole lake be treated with Sonar using a “6 bump 6” program. This is explained in more detail in the integrated treatment strategy.
2. **Vegetation surveys should be conducted to evaluate the plant community both before and after treatment in 2008.** A visual vegetation survey will be conducted in spring of 2008 to develop a Eurasian watermilfoil treatment map. A late season Tier II vegetation survey should be conducted after any herbicide treatments to evaluate the plant community.

7.0 Plant Management History

Eurasian watermilfoil weevils were stocked in Little Turkey Lake in 2000. The following press release was issued by the IDNR and summarizes this project.

For immediate release: June 6, 2000

Native insects employed to attack invasive plant

Lagrange, Whitley and Monroe county lakes to benefit from test

Tiny aquatic insects - weevils - will be stocked in two test lakes in northern Indiana and in one southern Indiana reservoir to control Eurasian watermilfoil, a plant that is an overwhelming nuisance in some Indiana lakes. The State Soil Conservation Board recently approved a grant of up to \$43,650 for a demonstration project using aquatic insects to control Eurasian watermilfoil (*Myriophyllum spicatum*), which is an exotic plant not originally from

North America.

This aquatic plant looks like a green bottlebrush, but invades lakes by rooting in soft soil and growing rapidly to form dense mats at the surface of the water. Eurasian watermilfoil crowds out desirable native plants, does not provide food for waterfowl or wildlife, and can make waterways unsuitable for boating, fishing, and swimming. The plant was first detected in Washington, D.C. in 1942. Eurasian watermilfoil is currently reported in 175 Indiana lakes and reservoirs. This summer, tiny milfoil eating weevils will be stocked in two test lakes in northern Indiana, Little Turkey Lake (Lagrange County) and Round Lake (Whitley County), and in one southern Indiana reservoir, Griffy Lake (Monroe County).

Lake associations and the City of Bloomington Parks and Recreation Department are providing local funds and cooperation to match the state grant for stocking and monitoring the weevils. These insects burrow into and destroy pest plants, but do not attach to swimmers or animals in the water. A supplier in Ohio (EnviroScience, Inc.) cultures and markets the weevils under the trade name MiddFoil(r). The company will stock several thousand of the insects on plant beds around the three demonstration lakes in Indiana. Another contractor will monitor the project to determine the success of the weevil treatment. Over the course of the project, Dr. Robin Scribailo, a professor of botany at Purdue University North Central and consultant for Aquatic Restoration Systems, LLC, will be measuring the extent of the milfoil, numbers of weevils, effects on other plants, and potential as a control agent in Indiana lakes.

Control of this plant can be very difficult. Mechanical harvesting actually spreads milfoil. As the harvester chops the plants, the broken pieces can drift to other areas, take root in the lake soil, and form new plant beds. Herbicides that are effective against milfoil are also very expensive and may have damaging effects on other plants or animals in the water. Control by these methods is usually temporary due to repeated introduction of the plants as boat trailers bring fragments from other infected lakes.

Biological control (introducing a specific predator or plant disease) can provide long-term management of a pest plant without harming beneficial plants, animals or humans. Once established, the control agent can maintain itself, reducing the need for repeated treatments.

Research at lakes in Minnesota, Vermont, Illinois, and Ohio shows that a North American weevil (*Euhrychiopsis lecontei*) prefers nesting in the exotic species of milfoil instead of native plants. The weevil lays its eggs on the tips of the milfoil plant. When the young hatch, they burrow down the stem, eat their way through the plant, and slow plant growth by shearing the top of the plant below the water surface. In test lakes, weevil stocking dramatically decreased large mats of Eurasian watermilfoil over a period of three to five years to a level that did not create a nuisance. The weevil occurs naturally in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Illinois, and was recently discovered in northern Indiana at Saugany Lake in LaPorte County.

District 2 Fisheries biologists were contacted to determine vegetation control permit records for Little Turkey Lake. Private herbicide treatments are not widespread on Little Turkey Lake. The majority of shoreline is not developed. Coontail and Eurasian watermilfoil are the major problem plants along the developed south and southwest shore of the lake.

8.0 Aquatic Plant Community Characterization Update

All lake management plans submitted for LARE funding must be accompanied by lake-wide aquatic vegetation surveys. These surveys are used to ensure that the plant community of the entire lake is adequately characterized. They provide information about the overall structure of the plant community, and describe species distribution and abundance in detail.

Two surveys are conducted on each lake in the first year it is involved in the LARE program. One survey is conducted in the spring and another is conducted later in the summer. This two-survey process is essential in providing an accurate representation of all plant species in a lake. Some species such as eel grass (*Vallisneria americana*) are not prevalent until summer and may be under-represented if only one survey was conducted in the spring. Other species such as curly-leaf pondweed (*Potamogeton crispus*) are prevalent in the spring and die off in the summer. This species would be under-represented if only one survey was conducted in the summer. Because of the diverse life cycles of different plants, multiple surveys increase the chance of accurately representing all of the species in a lake

Tier II survey protocols have been established by the IDNR to ensure that each lake is surveyed in the same manner. These surveys reduce subjectivity and provide a consistent basis for the evaluation of a lake's plant community from year to year, as well as a basis for comparing the plant communities of different lakes. They provide quantifiable results that are vital for monitoring the success of management programs. In short, these vegetation surveys are the foundation for describing an aquatic plant community and proposing an effective management strategy.

8.1 Methods

This section provides an overview of the purpose and procedures behind the Tier II vegetation surveys. The common goal of these surveys is to accurately describe the aquatic plant community of any particular lake. Standard procedures are established to ensure that:

1. The same survey procedures are used for each lake applying for funding.
2. Subjectivity is kept to a minimum to maintain scientific integrity.
3. The sample size for each survey adequately describes the plant community.
4. All data from each lake is recorded and analyzed in the same format.

In short, procedural and analytical consistency makes data from different surveys suitable for comparison and evaluation, while increasing its reliability and overall utility for evaluating the health of a plant community.

The Tier II survey involves using a specially designed rake to collect plants from numerous sites throughout the entire lake. At each site, each species found is recorded, and given an abundance rating based on the amount collected.

8.1.2 Tier II

The purpose of Tier II surveys is to document the distribution and abundance of submersed and floating-leaved aquatic vegetation throughout a lake (IDNR, 2004). A specific number of sample sites are selected based on the amount of surface acreage the lake possessed. Once sample sites are determined, sampling is accomplished using an aquatic vegetation sampling rake constructed according to the guidelines of the 2007 Tier II random sampling procedure manual.

Aquatic vegetation collected at each sample site is sorted according to species, and given a value to represent its abundance at that site. These values are recorded on data sheets distributed by the IDNR. These records are used for data analysis that served to characterize the aquatic vegetation community of a lake.

Random Sampling:

The Tier II survey protocol was updated by the IDNR in 2007. New LARE Tier II protocol requires that sample sites be stratified by depth contour, and that data analysis be provided for each depth contour. Rake scores for plant species are recorded as 1, 3, or 5, as opposed to the original scoring system of 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5.

The number of sample sites needed for a Tier II survey still is based on both lake size and trophic state, as it was in 2006. Trophic state describes the productivity of a lake and is correlated with plant growth, secchi disk, and nutrient availability. There are 4 different trophic states listed by the IDNR: Oligotrophic, Mesotrophic, Eutrophic, and Hypereutrophic. Oligotrophic Lakes usually have clear water and few nutrients, while Hypereutrophic lakes usually have deeply stained water and are nutrient rich. Table 3 is taken from the IDNR 2006 Tier II protocol and shows the maximum depth that must be sampled for a lake in each trophic state. In oligotrophic lakes, where water is clear, plants may be able to grow in up to 25 feet of water because sunlight may still reach the lake bottom in deep water. In hypereutrophic lakes where water is turbid, lack of sunlight will prevent plants from growing in deep water, so the maximum sampling depth is only 10 feet.

Table 4: Sample Depth by Trophic State

Trophic State	Maximum Depth of Sampling (ft)
Hypereutrophic	10
Eutrophic	15
Mesotrophic	20
Oligotrophic	25

Table 4 is used to calculate the number of sample sites need in each depth contour by using lake size and trophic status. The new protocol attempts to more accurately describe the entire littoral zone of a lake and provide more detailed data analysis by separating the littoral zone into 5 foot depth segments.

Table 5: Sample Sites by Lake Size and Trophic State

3

Tier II Sampling


Table 3. Sample size requirements as determined by lake size, trophic state, and apportioned by depth class.

Lake Acres	Total # of Sites	Hypereutrophic		Eutrophic			Mesotrophic				Oligotrophic				
		0-5 foot contour	5-10 foot contour	0-5 foot contour	5-10 foot contour	10-15 foot contour	0-5 foot contour	5-10 foot contour	10-15 foot contour	15-20 foot contour	0-5 foot contour	5-10 foot contour	10-15 foot contour	15-20 foot contour	20-25 foot contour
<10	20	10	10	10	7	3	10	5	3	2	10	4	3	2	1
10-49	30	20	10	10	10	10	10	10	7	3	10	10	5	3	2
50-99	40	30	10	17	13	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	7	3
100-199	50	40	10	23	17	10	14	14	12	10	10	10	10	10	10
200-299	60	50	10	30	20	10	18	16	16	10	14	12	12	12	10
300-399	70	60	10	37	23	10	22	20	18	10	17	15	14	14	10
400-499	80	70	10	43	27	10	25	23	22	10	19	18	17	16	10
500-799	90	80	10	50	30	10	29	27	24	10	22	21	19	18	10
>=800	100	90	10	57	33	10	33	31	26	10	25	23	22	20	10

8.2 Tier II Results

Two Tier II surveys were conducted by Aquatic Weed Control on Little Turkey Lake in 2007. The first survey took place on June 14, 2007 and the second took place on August 1, 2007. Secchi depth was measured at 3.2 in both the June and the August survey. Nine plant species were collected in June, while 11 plant species were collected in the August survey. Figure 8 shows all rake sample locations for the 2007 Tier II surveys on Little Turkey Lake.

Figure 8: Little Turkey Lake Rake Sample Locations



Tier II Data Analysis

The following tables are data summaries for the 2007 Tier II aquatic vegetation surveys. These tables help to describe the plant community, and will help identify any changes that take place in the years to come. Tables labeled “Overall” include every sample site in the survey, while the other tables describe each five foot depth contour of the lake’s littoral zone (0-5 feet, 5-10 feet, etc). Calculations for these tables include null values for each sample site where no plants were collected.

June 2007 Data Analysis

Table 6: June 2007 Data Analysis - Overall

Occurrence and Abundance of Submersed Aquatic Plants - Overall					
Lake:	Little Turkey	Secchi:	3.2	SE Mean Species/site:	0.2
Date:	6/14/07	Littoral sites with plants:	34	Mean natives/site:	1.10
Littoral depth (ft):	9.0	Number of species:	9	SE Mean natives/site:	0.15
Littoral sites:	40	Maximum species/site:	5	Species diversity:	0.79
Total sites:	50	Mean number species/site:	1.52	Native diversity:	0.71
			Score Frequency		
Common Name	Site Frequency	1	3	5	Dominance
Coontail	40.0	8.0	28.0	4.0	22.4
Eurasian Watermilfoil	36.0	24.0	10.0	2.0	12.8
Chara	34.0	26.0	4.0	4.0	11.6
Sago Pondweed	26.0	16.0	10.0	0.0	9.2
Brittle Naiad	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Whorled Watermilfoil	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Elodea	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	1.2
Bladderwort	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Curly-leaf Pondweed	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Small Pondweed	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.4

Table 7: June 2007 Data Analysis 0 - 5 Feet

Occurrence and Abundance of Submersed Aquatic Plants 0-5 Feet					
Lake:	Little Turkey	Secchi:	3.2	SE Mean Species/site:	0.27
Date:	6/14/07	Littoral sites with plants:	21	Mean natives/site:	1.52
Littoral depth (ft):	9.0	Number of species:	8	SE Mean natives/site:	0.21
Littoral sites:	23	Maximum species/site:	5	Species diversity:	0.80
Total sites:	23	Mean number species/site:	1.96	Native diversity:	0.72
			Score Frequency		
Common Name	Site Frequency	1	3	5	Dominance
Chara	52.2	34.8	8.7	8.7	20.9
Coontail	47.8	8.7	34.8	4.3	27.0
Sago Pondweed	39.1	21.7	17.4	0.0	14.8
Eurasian Watermilfoil	34.8	26.1	8.7	0.0	10.4
Elodea	4.3	0.0	4.3	0.0	2.6
Brittle Naiad	4.3	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.9
Curly-leaf Pondweed	4.3	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.9
Small Pondweed	4.3	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.9
Whorled Watermilfoil	4.3	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.9

Table 8: June 2007 Data Analysis 5 - 10 Feet

Occurrence and Abundance of Submersed Aquatic Plants 5-10 Feet					
Lake:	Little Turkey	Secchi:	3.2	SE Mean Species/site:	0.36
Date:	6/14/07	Littoral sites with plants:	13	Mean natives/site:	1.18
Littoral depth (ft):	9.0	Number of species:	6	SE Mean natives/site:	0.27
Littoral sites:	17	Maximum species/site:	5	Species diversity:	0.77
Total sites:	17	Mean number species/site:	1.82	Native diversity:	0.69
			Score Frequency		
Common Name	Site Frequency	1	3	5	Dominance
Eurasian Watermilfoil	58.8	35.3	17.6	5.9	23.5
Coontail	52.9	11.8	35.3	5.9	29.4
Chara	29.4	29.4	0.0	0.0	5.9
Sago Pondweed	23.5	17.6	5.9	0.0	7.1
Bladderwort	5.9	5.9	0.0	0.0	1.2
Brittle Naiad	5.9	5.9	0.0	0.0	1.2
Whorled Watermilfoil	5.9	5.9	0.0	0.0	1.2

August 2007 Data Analysis**Table 9: August 2007 Data Analysis - Overall**

Occurrence and Abundance of Submersed Aquatic Plants - Overall					
Lake:	Little Turkey	Secchi:	3.2	SE Mean Species/site:	0.23
Date:	8/1/07	Littoral sites with plants:	32	Mean natives/site:	1.16
Littoral depth (ft):	8.0	Number of species:	11	SE Mean natives/site:	0.18
Littoral sites:	39	Maximum species/site:	5	Species diversity:	0.85
Total sites:	50	Mean number species/site:	1.68	Native diversity:	0.77
			Score Frequency		
Common Name	Site Frequency	1	3	5	Dominance
Coontail	36.0	14.0	1.0	12.0	20.8
Sago Pondweed	32.0	24.0	8.0	0.0	9.6
Brittle Naiad	26.0	12.0	10.0	4.0	12.4
Eurasian Watermilfoil	24.0	18.0	4.0	2.0	8.0
Chara	24.0	22.0	2.0	0.0	5.6
Illinois Pondweed	12.0	4.0	6.0	2.0	6.4
Slender Naiad	4.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	1.6
Bladderwort	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	1.2
Curly-leaf Pondweed	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Elodea	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Flat-stemmed Pondweed	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Small Pondweed	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Filamentous Algae	8.0				

Table 10: August 2007 Data Analysis 0 - 5 Feet

Occurrence and Abundance of Submersed Aquatic Plants 0-5 Feet					
Lake:	Little Turkey	Secchi:	3.2	SE Mean Species/site:	0.27
Date:	8/1/07	Littoral sites with plants:	22	Mean natives/site:	1.83
Littoral depth (ft):	8.0	Number of species:	10	SE Mean natives/site:	0.25
Littoral sites:	23	Maximum species/site:	5	Species diversity:	0.85
Total sites:	23	Mean number species/site:	2.52	Native diversity:	0.78
			Score Frequency		
Common Name	Site Frequency	1	3	5	Dominance
Coontail	56.5	30.4	8.7	17.4	28.7
Sago Pondweed	47.8	30.4	17.4	0.0	16.5
Eurasian Watermilfoil	34.8	26.1	8.7	0.0	10.4
Chara	34.8	30.4	4.3	0.0	8.7
Brittle Naiad	30.4	17.4	13.0	0.0	11.3
Illinois Pondweed	21.7	8.7	8.7	4.3	11.3
Slender Naiad	8.7	4.3	4.3	0.0	3.5
Bladderwort	4.3	0.0	4.3	0.0	2.6
Curly-leaf Pondweed	4.3	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.9
Elodea	4.3	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.9
Small Pondweed	4.3	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.9
Filamentous Algae	17.4				

Table 11: August 2007 Data Analysis 5 - 10 Feet

Occurrence and Abundance of Submersed Aquatic Plants 5-10 Feet					
Lake:	Little Turkey	Secchi:	3.2	SE Mean Species/site:	0.39
Date:	8/1/07	Littoral sites with plants:	10	Mean natives/site:	0.94
Littoral depth (ft):	8.0	Number of species:	7	SE Mean natives/site:	0.28
Littoral sites:	16	Maximum species/site:	5	Species diversity:	0.80
Total sites:	17	Mean number species/site:	1.53	Native diversity:	0.73
			Score Frequency		
Common Name	Site Frequency	1	3	5	Dominance
Brittle Naiad	35.3	11.8	11.8	11.8	21.2
Coontail	29.4	0.0	17.6	11.8	22.4
Sago Pondweed	29.4	29.4	0.0	0.0	5.9
Eurasian Watermilfoil	23.5	17.6	0.0	5.9	9.4
Chara	23.5	23.5	0.0	0.0	4.7
Illinois Pondweed	5.9	0.0	5.9	0.0	3.5
Flat-stemmed Pondweed	5.9	5.9	0.0	0.0	1.2
Filamentous Algae	0.0				

Site Frequency


Site frequency is a measure of how often a species was collected during the Tier II survey. It can be calculated by the following equation:

$$\text{Site Frequency} = \frac{(\# \text{ of sites where the species was collected})}{\text{Total \# of littoral sample sites}} \times 100$$

Table 12 shows site frequencies for every plant collected in the 2007 Tier II surveys. Coontail was the most frequently collected plant in both surveys in 2007. Eurasian watermilfoil was the second most frequently collected plant in spring, and appeared to show a small amount of natural die off as the year progressed. Chara and sago pondweed, two native species were also collected frequently in both surveys.

Table 12: 2007 Site Frequencies

Little Turkey Lake Site Frequencies - 2007



Species Diversity

The species diversity indices listed in the data analysis tables to describe the overall plant community. A species diversity index is actually measured as a value of uncertainty (H). If a species is chosen at random from a collection containing a certain number of species, the diversity index (H) is the probability that a chosen species will be different from the previous random selection. The diversity index (H) will always be between 0 and 1. The higher the H value, the more likely it is that the next species chosen from the collection at random will be different from the previous selection (Smith, 2001). This index is dependent upon species richness and species evenness, meaning that species diversity is a function of how many different species are present and how evenly they are spread throughout the ecosystem.


The species diversity index for Little Turkey Lake in June of 2007 was 0.79 which is above average when compared with area lakes. Species diversity in August of 2007 was 0.85. Native species diversity scores were slightly lower, at 0.71 in June and 0.77 in August. This means that exotic species account for some of the diversity in Little Turkey Lake.

Species Dominance

Species dominance is dependent upon how many times a species occurs and its relative coverage area or biomass within the system. In this survey, the abundance rating given to each species at each sample site was used to determine dominance. The dominance of a particular species in this Tier II survey increases as its site frequency and relative abundance increase.

Table 13 tracks dominance values for each plant collected at Little Turkey Lake in 2007. Trends are similar to site frequency, with coontail being the most dominant plant in both 2007 surveys. Eurasian watermilfoil was the second most dominant plant in both surveys. Illinois pondweed, which was not collected in June of 2007, had a dominance score of 6.4 in August.

Table 13: 2007 Species Dominance



8.3 Macrophyte Inventory Discussion

Based upon 2007 survey data, Little Turkey Lake has a submersed aquatic plant community with relatively high diversity when compared with many area lakes, although 6 species had very low site frequency. Species richness in Little Turkey Lake was 9 species in June of 2007 and 11 species in August of 2007. The plant community is dominated by coontail and Eurasian watermilfoil. Coontail had site frequencies of 40% and 36% in the 2007 surveys. Eurasian watermilfoil had site frequencies of 36% and 24% in 2007.

Plants in Little Turkey Lake were not collected in depths greater than 9 feet in 2007. This is likely due to low water clarity. Secchi depth readings were low at 3.2 feet in both surveys.

Eurasian watermilfoil showed some decline from June to August. This is likely a natural die off, as herbicide treatments on Little Turkey Lake are limited. This slight decline could be caused by low water clarity or high water temperatures in summer, or even milfoil weevils which were introduced in the lake in 2007. A similar trend has been noted in other northern Indiana lakes (Big Lake, Shipshewana Lake) with low water clarity.

Based on 2007 survey results, Eurasian watermilfoil is the main management concern in Little Turkey Lake. Coontail is also very abundant in Little Turkey Lake, but LARE funds will not be awarded for its control since it is a native plant. No matter what LARE treatment strategy is adopted for Little Turkey Lake, coontail will likely continue to cause recreational problems along piers and docks. It is important for lake residents to know that recreational problems from excessive vegetation will still be present after LARE herbicide treatments, and that coontail treatments must be privately funded. Figure 9 shows a dense plant bed dominated by coontail.

Figure 9: Little Turkey Lake Coontail Bed



In summary, Little Turkey Lake is characterized by a submersed plant community with high diversity (0.79 – 0.85), low water clarity (secchi depth 3.2 ft.) and abundant dense beds of Eurasian watermilfoil and coontail.

9.0 Aquatic Plant Management Alternatives

Little Turkey Lake currently has Eurasian watermilfoil distributed throughout the lake. Eurasian milfoil is believed to have arrived in North America in the mid 1940's and has spread throughout the east coast to northern Florida and the Midwest. Eurasian milfoil spreads by fragmentation and seed dispersal, and it has the ability to over-winter from year to year. Once it is in a lake it can become the dominant plant species because it forms dense canopies which shade out the native, more beneficial plant species below. There is also increasing evidence that mat forming species like Eurasian milfoil and curly leaf pondweed exert significant negative impacts on a broad range of aquatic organisms (Pullman, 1998)

Many management strategies have been used to control Eurasian milfoil in Indiana lakes. A management strategy should be chosen based on its selectivity of the pest in question, its long term effectiveness, and its environmental risks. The main goal of this plan is to choose a management option that can effectively control the Eurasian milfoil with little or no environmental risk, while causing no harm to native plant or fish species.

9.1 No Action

If no action is taken, the Eurasian milfoil abundance may increase from year to year. Eurasian milfoil grows by fragmentation, meaning that if the plant is cut, the fragment has the ability to form an entirely new plant. Eurasian milfoil also over-winters as an adult plant so new generations are created in each growing season. These reproductive characteristics cause milfoil beds become more dense over time, which can create a monoculture as it may eliminate more and more native species from a lake.

9.2 Institutional-Protection of Beneficial Vegetation

Lake users can play an important role in the protection of beneficial aquatic vegetation. Aquatic invasive species often gain a foothold in an ecosystem in areas disturbed by human activity or natural processes. In many cases, boating may be restricted in certain areas of a lake to prevent harm to native plants, especially many emergent species. Boating lanes may be established through areas of emergent vegetations, and protected ecological zones may be created to prevent erosion off shoreline vegetation caused by intense wave action from boating activities. Shallow areas of a lake may also be marked with buoys to prevent injury to boaters and water skiers. It is important to obey boating restrictions to protect beneficial plant species and even prevent personal injury.

A healthy aquatic plant community is absolutely essential for the maintenance of a stable, diverse ecosystem. Aquatic plants provide habitat for plankton, insects, crustaceans, fish, and amphibians. They take nutrients like phosphorus and nitrogen out of the water column, increase water clarity, prevent harmful algal blooms, produce oxygen and provide food for waterfowl. Aquatic plants can even remove pollutants from contaminated water, and prevent the suspension of particulate matter by stabilizing sediment and preventing erosion from wave action or current.

The LARE aquatic vegetation management program recognizes the importance of beneficial aquatic vegetation and its protection is a top priority. The most basic goal for the LARE aquatic vegetation program is to maintain healthy aquatic ecosystems by maintaining or improving biodiversity in Indiana lakes. The purpose of conducting aquatic vegetation surveys is to document the overall health of plant communities and identify any ecosystem whose stability is threatened by invasive plant species.

Once a problem area is identified, a management strategy must be formulated that directly impacts the aquatic plant community in a positive way. While eradicating invasive plants is a major component of many management strategies, it is important to note the ultimate goal is not to eradicate aquatic vegetation, but to protect beneficial vegetation and protect lake ecosystems.

9.3 Environmental Manipulation

9.3.1 Water Level Manipulation

Draw down of the lake water level is one option that may help the Eurasian milfoil problem. Lower water levels expose the Eurasian milfoil roots to freezing and thawing, which may kill may kill milfoil root systems. However, a lake draw down will not only kill Eurasian milfoil, but native plants as well. Also, reducing the lake level would make new areas of the lake available

for vegetative growth, and Eurasian milfoil may have an advantage in the colonization of these new areas if it is not eradicated prior to the lake draw down.

9.3.2 Nutrient Reduction

Limiting factors for plant growth include light, lake morphometry and depth, substrate and the availability of nutrients like phosphorus and nitrogen. While lake morphometry is most highly correlated with plant biomass, the availability of phosphorus and nitrogen have a tremendous impact on the amount of plant growth in a body of water. If the vast majority of phosphorus in a system is tied up in plant matter, it may be difficult for an invasive species to gain a foothold and spread rapidly in the lake. If phosphorus is constantly being added to the system and is readily available in the water, then invasive species will have an unlimited food supply should a disturbance create the opportunity for them to proliferate in a body of water.

Phosphorus and nitrogen are added to aquatic systems by many natural sources, such as the



www.epa.gov

decomposition of plant material, and animal waste, but human activity is often responsible for excessive phosphorus loading that contributes to blue-green algal blooms, overabundant vegetation growth and a general decline in water quality. Major contributions of excess phosphorus come from sources such as septic system

inputs, agricultural runoff, storm water drainage, lawn fertilizer applications, , and improper disposal of grass clippings and tree leaves. Owners of lake front property can significantly reduce the amount of phosphorus entering the lake by taking actions outlined in the public education section.

9.4 Mechanical Controls

9.4.1 Mechanical Cutting and Harvesting

Mechanical harvesting uses a large machine to cut and collect unwanted aquatic plants. These machines pick up the cut weeds but will still leave small fragments that will have the ability to re-grow. Also, after an area is harvested the Eurasian milfoil generally re-grows first causing the



www.cleanlake.com

native plants to be shaded out again. Mechanical harvesting is also not selective in its control. The harvesting will cut the native plant species as well as the exotics if both are present in the same area. For these reasons, mechanical harvesting is not recommended. Harvesting can be accomplished by individual owners around their dock areas. A lake property owner can legally harvest a 625 square foot area. (25 feet by 25 feet).

9.5 Manual Controls

9.5.1 Hand Pulling, Cutting, Raking



www.ecy.wa.gov

Manual controls such as hand pulling, cutting and raking can be effective ways to control unwanted plants in certain situations. In very shallow clear water, small areas of vegetation can be identified and cleared effectively by hand. Large areas of vegetation, especially those in deeper water can be extremely difficult to control using these methods. Many of the harvested weeds will break apart, leaving the root system in the lake bottom. Failure to remove root structures will result in re-growth.

Plants that possess the ability to reproduce through fragmentation can seldom be effectively controlled by these methods if they are distributed throughout a lake. Identifying every area of infestation would be difficult, as would harvesting the plants without causing fragmentation of individual plants. Any plant fragments not removed from the water can form new plants, meaning that hand pulling and cutting can facilitate the spread of the unwanted plant species.

9.5.2 Bottom Barriers

Bottom Barriers prevent the growth of aquatic plants by lining the bottom of a lake or pond with a material that prohibits light from reaching the lake bottom and that is difficult for plants to



www.ecy.wa.gov

penetrate. Many times, plastic or concrete barriers are used to prevent the growth of aquatic vegetation during construction of a lake or pond. This form of control is best implemented during construction of a new pond, and placing a bottom barrier in an existing lake would involve significant challenges and be extremely expensive. A draw down of the lake may be necessary to install the barrier, and if the lake level is not regulated by control structures, this can be almost impossible. For a large lake, material costs alone would be enormous.

Once in place, the barrier would prevent not only invasive plant growth, but native plant growth as well, destabilizing the lake ecosystem and having a negative impact on insect and fish communities. Sediment would gradually accumulate on top of the barrier, and aquatic plant growth would return as plants begin to take root in the sediment on top of the barrier. An IDNR permit is required for the placement of a bottom Barrier.

9.6 Biological Controls

9.6.1 Water Milfoil Weevil



www.pca.state.mn.us

The watermilfoil weevil is a native North American insect that consumes Eurasian milfoil and northern milfoil. The weevil was discovered after a decline in the Eurasian milfoil population was observed in Brownington Pond, Vermont (Creed and Sheldon, 1993). The milfoil weevil burrows down into the stem of the plant and consumes the tissue of the plant. Holes in the milfoil stem bored by weevil larvae allow disease to enter the plant. These same holes also cause a

release of the plants' gases which reduces buoyancy and causes the plant to sink (Creed et. Al. 1992).

Studies conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of the water milfoil weevil have not yielded consistent results. Factors influencing the weevil's success or failure in a body of water are not well documented. In 2003, Scribailo and Alix conducted a weevil test on Round Lake in Indiana and found no conclusive evidence that the Eurasian milfoil populations were reduced. An IDNR permit is required for the stocking of the watermilfoil weevil.

9.6.2 Grass Carp

The Asian grass carp or white amur (*Ctenopharyngodon idella*) is an herbivorous fish that is native to eastern Russia and China. This fish has been introduced into the U.S. to help control aquatic vegetation. To prevent their uncontrolled proliferation, all fish stocked in Indiana must be triploid, meaning that they cannot reproduce. Stocking is restricted to privately owned bodies



www.tpwd.state.tx.us

of water, and suppliers must obtain a special permit from the IDNR. Grass carp are completely vegetarian, feeding on many species of submersed plants, along with some floating plants such as duckweed. Hydrilla, a highly invasive plant found in many southern states is a preferred food of grass carp and

efforts to control hydrilla with grass carp have been successful.

According to the Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Foundation, grass carp avoid Eurasian milfoil, and show strong preferences for many native plants along with hydrilla. The success of grass carp stockings is highly dependent upon the food sources available to the fish. When Eurasian milfoil occurs along with native plant populations, grass carp are not recommended. Grass carp are not currently permitted for stocking in public waters.

9.7 Chemical Controls

9.7.1 Aquatic Herbicides

There are two major categories of aquatic herbicides: contact and systemic herbicides. Contact herbicides are used best to control the majority of the weeds close to shore, around piers and in man-made channels. Examples of contact herbicides are Reward (active ingredient: diquat), and Aquathal (active ingredient: endothal).

Contact herbicides would not be a wise choice for a whole lake treatment because of their lack of selectivity and their inability to eliminate the root systems of treated plants. These characteristics could result in unnecessary damage to native species, as well as greater potential for the re-infestation of Eurasian milfoil.

Systemic herbicides are absorbed by the plant and transported to the root systems where they eliminate both the roots and the plant. Examples of systemic herbicides are Sonar and Avast (active ingredient: fluridone), Navigate, Aqua Kleen, DMA4 (active ingredient 2, 4-D) and Renovate (active ingredient: triclopyr). All of these chemicals effectively kill Eurasian milfoil plants and roots. Based on the author's experience and other lake managers in the Midwest, whole lake treatments using fluridone are the most effective way to control Eurasian water milfoil in lakes that have become severely infested. Fluridone can be applied at low rates to control the Eurasian milfoil while causing little or no harm to the majority of the native weed species present in the lake.

2, 4-D and Renovate (active ingredient: triclopyr) are both root control herbicides which can be used for spot treatments in small areas of Eurasian milfoil infestation, while the whole lake must be treated if Sonar (fluridone) is used. The major difference between 2, 4-D and triclopyr is that triclopyr may have the ability to control the Eurasian milfoil longer than 2,4-D. Renovate (triclopyr) has only been available for use for the past three seasons, and the ability of Renovate to provide more long term control of Eurasian milfoil than 2,4-D in spot treatment situations is still being documented. 2, 4-D is less expensive to use but if triclopyr shows better long term control in treated areas it may become the most cost effective long term investment.

The public's primary concern with the use of aquatic herbicides is safety. Every chemical registered for aquatic applications has undergone extensive testing prior to becoming available for use. These tests demonstrate that when these herbicides are applied properly at labeled rates, they are safe for humans and will not directly cause any adverse environmental effects.

10.0 Public Involvement

A LARE meeting was held on November 8, 2007 to discuss issues pertaining to Little Turkey Lake. District 2 Fisheries biologists Neil Ledet and Lary Koza, Aquatic Weed Control and LARE Aquatic biologists Angela Sturdevant and Gwen White were all present and discussed the plant community of Little Turkey Lake. Discussion at this meeting helped to develop the 2008 management strategy.

A public lake meeting was held for Little Turkey Lake on June 30, 2007. Jim Donahoe of Aquatic Weed Control summarized LARE management activities and outlined the treatment options to help contain the Eurasian watermilfoil population in the lake.

Public questionnaires were handed out at the public lake association meeting. Residents were concerned about Eurasian watermilfoil and about possible assistance to help control it. Table 14 is a summary of the 2007 public questionnaires.

Table 14: Public Questionnaire

Lake Use Survey (16 total) Lake name Little Turkey Lake
 Are you a lake property owner? Yes 16 No 0
 Are you currently a member of your lake association? Yes 16 No 0
 How many years have you been at the lake? 2 or less - 3
 2 - 5 years - 5
 5-10 years - 4
 Over 10 years - 4
 How do you use the lake (mark all that apply)
10 Swimming 0 Irrigation
13 Boating 0 Drinking water
14 Fishing 2 Other _____

Do you have aquatic plants at your shoreline in nuisance quantities? Yes 11 No 5

Do you currently participate in a weed control project on the lake? Yes 3 No 10

Does aquatic vegetation interfere with your use or enjoyment of the lake? Yes 12 No 4

Does the level of vegetation in the lake affect your property values? Yes 5 No 3

Are you in favor of continuing efforts to control vegetation on the lake? Yes 15 No 1

Are you aware that the LARE funds will only apply to work controlling invasive exotic species, and more work may need to be privately funded? Yes 14 No 2

Mark any of these you think are problems on your lake:

- 1 Too many boats access the lake
- 0 Use of jet skis on the lake
- 2 Too much fishing
- 2 Fish population problem
- 8 Dredging needed
- 6 Overuse by nonresidents
- 12 Too many aquatic plants
- 1 Not enough aquatic plants
- 7 Poor water quality
- 0 Pier/funneling problem

Please add any comments:

Currently the lake is very green because there are not
enough weeds to uptake dissolved nutrients;
bass club speeding and ill manners concerning
lake owners' property; lake too small for bass
tournaments that happens once a weekend (mon. or weekend)
No one has room to fish when the bass tournaments
are here. would like to eliminate them.

11.0 Public Education

Lake residents play an important role in establishing and maintaining a healthy lake community. Lake association meetings and newsletters are excellent avenues through which this information about management practices on Little Turkey Lake can be distributed. These meetings can also help to inform the public about practical steps that they can take to improve Little Turkey Lake. The following information is designed to give practical suggestions on ways that lake residents can reduce nutrient loading and improve the Little Turkey Lake ecosystem.

1. **Ensure that existing homes be connected to a properly maintained lake wide sewer system if possible.** Many older homes possess septic systems without proper filter beds. Some systems may have significant leaks, while some may drain into the lake. Sewage leaks add tremendous amounts of nutrients to the water, along with harmful bacteria. If a lake does not have a sewer system, the proper maintenance of septic tanks and filter beds can help reduce nutrient loading.
2. **Limit lawn fertilizer use in areas where runoff will enter the lake.** If a fertilizer application must be applied, avoid spreading fertilizer directly into the lake, on sidewalks, or sea walls where it will wash into the lake. Try to avoid applying fertilizer within 30 feet of the shoreline. If fertilizer must be used, low phosphorus or no phosphorus fertilizer is preferred for use.
3. **Work with farmers within the lake catchment to increase proper filtration and drainage of agricultural land before runoff reaches the lake.** The Indiana state government offers incentives for farmers to address soil and water concerns through the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The Indiana Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) provides technical and financial aid to reduce soil erosion, reduce sediment in lakes and streams, and improve overall water quality. Farmers owning highly erodible land or property adjacent to tributary streams or lakes may be eligible for funding that can increase water quality significantly. Further information can be found at www.in.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/CRP/crphomepage.html or by contacting the following address.
 Indiana NRCS
 6013 Lakeside Boulevard
 Indianapolis, Indiana 46278-2933
 Phone: (317) 290-3200
 FAX: (317) 290-3225
4. **Avoid blowing grass clippings and tree leaves into the lake.** Many pond owners know that grass clippings blown into a pond can turn into a floating mat of algae in only a few days. This occurs because cut and decaying vegetation rapidly releases nutrients into the water.
5. **Prevent or reduce urban and industrial runoff flowing directly into the lake.** Urban runoff can be one of the most detrimental factors influencing water quality. Not only are nutrients and sediment carried to lakes through storm sewers, but harmful contaminants as well. Oil, antifreeze, gasoline, road salt, and other pollutants are washed from pavement and can all end up harming a lake ecosystem.

The following are practical steps recommended by the United States Environmental Protection Agency to reduce urban runoff:

- a) Protect areas that provide important water quality benefits or are particularly susceptible to erosion or sediment loss.
- b) Limit land disturbance such as clearing and grading and cut fill to reduce erosion and sediment loss.
- c) Limit disturbance of natural drainage features and vegetation.
- d) Place bridge structures so that sensitive and valuable aquatic ecosystems are protected.
- e) Prepare and implement an approved erosion control plan.
- f) Ensure proper storage and disposal of toxic material.
- g) Incorporate pollution prevention into operation and maintenance procedures to reduce pollutant loadings to surface runoff.
- h) Develop and implement runoff pollution controls for existing road systems to reduce pollutant concentrations and volumes.

Further information about urban runoff in Indiana can be obtained by contacting the EPA Region 5 National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Storm Water Coordinator by calling (312) 886-6100.


6. **Establish ecological zones to protect existing wetlands and emergent vegetation from turbulence caused by boats.** Wetlands not only filter water, but they also stabilize shoreline areas that would otherwise be highly erodable. Submersed and emergent vegetation can be eliminated by heavy wave action, which destabilizes the shoreline and reduces the lake's natural defense against sediment and nutrient loading. It is extremely important to make sure that existing wetlands remain intact to aid in the natural water purification process. If possible lake associations should identify significant wetland areas and work with the IDNR to protect them from drainage and disruption.

Hydrilla

Hydrilla (*Hydrilla verticillata*) is an invasive aquatic plant species common throughout the southern United States. It is federally listed as a noxious weed and causes severe ecological and recreational problems wherever it grows. It is considered to be much more destructive than other invasives like Eurasian watermilfoil and curly leaf pondweed because of its reproductive adaptations. It grows by fragmentation, as does Eurasian watermilfoil, but it also produces turions which can remain dormant in the sediment for 4 years or more (Van and Steward, 1990). It produces tubers at its root tips which can also reproduce after multiple years of dormancy. It can grow 1 inch each day and it quickly out-competes native plants. It forms dense beds that eliminate native plants, stunt fish populations, impede recreation and cause a drastic decrease in biodiversity (Colle and Shireman, 1980). Millions of dollars are spent each year for hydrilla maintenance each year in Florida alone. Eradication is unlikely once a population has been well established, although eradication has been achieved in newly infested waters using a herbicide called Sonar. Sonar



is applied at a rate of 6 parts per billion and this concentration is maintained in the water for 180 days. Early detection can be crucial to an effective eradication program, and all lake residents and



users are encouraged to be on the look-out for this invader. In August of 2006, this plant was found in Lake Manitou, in Rochester, Indiana. This is the first instance of hydrilla in the upper Midwest. Prior to its appearance in Lake Manitou, The closest infestations of hydrilla were in Tennessee and Pennsylvania.

Hydrilla can easily be confused with native elodea. The major difference is that elodea has sets of leaves on the stem in whorls of three, while hydrilla usually has whorls of 5 leaves, although 4 to 9 leaves per whorl are possible with hydrilla. Hydrilla will also have small serrations on the leaf edges. More information on hydrilla can be found at the University of Florida's Center for Aquatic Invasive Plants (<http://plants.ifas.ufl.edu/>). More general information on aquatic invaders can be found at www.protectyourwaters.net.

12.0 Integrated Management Action Strategy

Funding may be awarded by the LARE program in 2008 for herbicide treatments in areas of Eurasian watermilfoil infestation. Chemical treatment options for selective, root control of Eurasian watermilfoil include the following herbicides: Sonar (active ingredient: fluridone), Renovate (active ingredient: triclopyr), and 2, 4-D. Based on past experience, Sonar treatments generally provide the most complete control of Eurasian watermilfoil and can also provide multiple years of control. Renovate and 2, 4-D, while very effective, are normally applied to the same areas on a yearly basis to provide control.

Aquatic Weed Control recommends the use of Sonar to treat Eurasian watermilfoil in Little Turkey Lake because of its widespread distribution. A fluridone treatment has numerous ecological advantages over other herbicides for Eurasian milfoil control over large areas. Fluridone will not only kill Eurasian milfoil plants as other herbicides would, but it will also kill its root systems, reducing the chance for rapid re-growth. One extremely important advantage of using fluridone is that it can selectively kill Eurasian milfoil plants while causing little if any long term harm to native plants. This will allow native plants to re-establish themselves as the Eurasian milfoil population declines.

The herbicide applicators will use a “6 bump 6” program to achieve maximum control of Eurasian watermilfoil in Little Turkey Lake. This means the entire lake would be treated with 6 ppb (parts per billion) of fluridone. This is the lowest rate of fluridone that will achieve control of Eurasian watermilfoil and is the only fluridone concentration for Eurasian watermilfoil currently accepted by the IDNR for Eurasian watermilfoil control. After the initial treatment, applicators will allow three weeks for the fluridone to be absorbed by the Eurasian milfoil. At the conclusion of 3 weeks from the initial treatment date, a FasTEST will be conducted, meaning that water samples will be taken to determine the concentration of fluridone still present in Little Turkey Lake. These water samples will be sent to SePro (Manufacturer of Sonar). After performing the FasTEST and determining this concentration, a second application of fluridone will take place to increase the Sonar concentration back to 6 parts per billion in Little Turkey Lake.

It is important to note that Eurasian watermilfoil will be the only plant species specifically targeted in this project, as LARE funds will only be awarded for the control of invasive plant species. The goal is not to eliminate vegetation in Little Turkey Lake, but to improve the health of the plant community. Native vegetation will still be abundant in shallow areas after treatment, and control of these natives must be privately funded. The goal will be to reduce the Eurasian watermilfoil population and allow for the recovery of native plant species that will provide better fish habitat, foster good water quality and pose less interference to recreational use of the lake.

13.0 Project Budget

Cost estimates for whole lake Sonar treatment are included in Table 15. These figures are estimates only and are subject to change pending future chemical pricing.

Table 15: Future Cost Estimates

Project	2008	2009	2010	3 Year Cost Totals
Whole Lake Fluridone Treatment - 6ppb	\$28,100	\$0	\$0	\$28,100
Additional 2 ppb to Control Coontail Additional Cost to Association (Not Eligible for LARE Funding)	\$3,400	\$0	\$0	\$3,400
Follow Up Spot Treatments using 2, 4-D	\$0	\$5,400 If needed	\$5,400	\$10,800
Total Estimated Costs	\$ 31,500	\$ 5,400	\$ 5,400	\$42,300
LARE Share – subject to availability	\$ 25,290	\$ 4,860	\$ 4,860	\$35,010
Association's Share	\$ 6,210	\$ 540	\$ 540	\$7,290

The alternative to a whole lake treatment would be to treat large areas of Little Turkey Lake with 2, 4-D on Renovate herbicide for the control of Eurasian watermilfoil. These treatments are effective, but they would not provide the level of control on a lake wide basis that Sonar would provide. Renovate and 2, 4-D treatments usually do not provide multiple years of control, whereas Sonar can provide multiple years of Eurasian watermilfoil control. Renovate and 2, 4-D treatments would likely have to take place in the same areas year after year to maintain control of Eurasian watermilfoil. Cost estimates for this treatment plan are listed in Table 16.

Table 16: Alternative Management Plan

Project	2008	2009	2010	3 Year Cost Totals
Treat up to 45 acres with 2, 4-D	\$16,200	\$16,200	\$16,200	\$48,600
Total Estimated Costs	\$16,200	\$16,200	\$16,200	\$48,600
Total LARE share – subject to availability	\$14,580	\$14,580	\$14,580	\$43,740
Total Association's Share	\$1,620	\$1,620	\$1,620	\$4,860

Survey and Planning Costs

Current survey and planning costs for 2008 are estimated at \$4,000. This cost is subject to a 90% cost share with the LARE program. LARE would pay \$2,600 and the lake association would be responsible to pay \$400 toward this cost.

14.0 Monitoring and plan Update Procedures

A visual inspection should be used in spring of 2008 to confirm Eurasian watermilfoil abundance in Little Turkey Lake. This visual survey will be used to develop a Eurasian watermilfoil treatment map which will be submitted to the IDNR for approval. Should the proposed treatment areas be approved, the LARE funded herbicide treatment will then take place.

A late season Tier II quantitative vegetation survey will also be conducted in 2008. This survey will take place after the LARE funded herbicide treatment, and will be used to evaluate populations of both native and invasive plants in Little Turkey Lake.

15.0 References

Blessing, Arlene. 2004. Fundamentals of Pesticide Use: Indiana Pesticide Applicator Core Training Manual. Purdue University. West Lafayette, Indiana 106 pp.

Cunningham, Willam P., and Saigo, Barwbara W. 2001. Environmental Science: a Global Concern. McGraw Hill Inc. Boston, Massachusetts 646.

Dow Agrosiences Invasive Species Management. 1998-2007. Dow Agrosiences LLC. <http://www.dowagro.com/ivm/invasive/prod/dma.htm>

Getsinger, Kurt Ph.D. 2005. Aquatic Plant Management: Best Management Practices in Support of Fish and Wildlife Habitat. The Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Foundation. 78 pp.

Harza Engineering. 1990. Big Turkey and Little Turkey Lake Enhancement Feasibility Study. Chicago, Illinois.

IDNR. 2004. Procedure Manual for Surveying Aquatic Vegetation: Tier II Reconnaissance Surveys. IN Department of Natural Resources, Division of Soil Conservation.

IDNR 2004. Procedure manual for surveying Aquatic Vegetation: Tier I and Tier II, Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Kalff, Jacob. 2002. Limnology: Inland Water Ecosystems. Prentice Hall. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey. 592 pp.

Kannenburg, James R., and Schmidt, James C. 1998. How to Identify and Control Water Weeds and Algae: 5th edition. Applied Biochemists. Milwaukee, Wisconsin. 128pp.

Lembi, Carole 1997. Aquatic Pest Control: Category 5. Department of Botany and Plant Pathology: Purdue University. West Lafayette, Indiana. 58pp.

Ledet, Neil and Koza, Larry. 2003. Little Turkey Lake Fish Management Report. IN Department of Natural Resources. Division of Fish & Wildlife. Indianapolis, Indiana

Pearson, Jed. 2004. A Proposed Sampling Method to Assess Occurrence, Abundance and Distribution of Submersed Aquatic Plants in Indiana Lakes. IN Department of Natural Resources. Division of Fish & Wildlife. Indianapolis, Indiana 37 pp.

Pullman, Douglas G. 1998. The Lake Association Leaders Aquatic Vegetation Management Guidance Manual.

Renovate 3 Specimen Label. 2003. SePRO Corporation. www.sepro.com

Scribailo, Robin W. Ph.D. & Alix, Mitchell S. 2003. Final Report on the Weevil Release Study for Indiana Lakes. Department of Botany and Plant Pathology. Purdue University. West Lafayette, IN.

Smith, Robert Leo and Smith, Thomas M. 2001. Ecology and Field Biology. Addison Wesley Longman, Inc. San Francisco, California. 771 pp.

Stern, Kinsingly R. 2000. Introductory Plant Biology. McGraw Hill. Madison, Wisconsin. 557 pp.

Tyllia, J. 2000. Northeastern Indiana Fishing Map Guide. Superior, Wisconsin. 184 pp.

16.0 Appendices

16.1 Calculations

Fluridone Calculations:

The following paragraph is taken directly from the Sonar A.S. label. It outlines the specific procedures for calculating the amount of Fluridone needed to treat a body of water.

Application Rate Calculation - Ponds, Lakes and Reservoirs

The amount of Sonar A.S. to be applied to provide the desired ppb concentration of active ingredient in treated water may be calculated as follows:

Quarts of Sonar A.S. required per treated surface acre =
Average water depth of treatment site (feet)
x Desired ppb concentration of active ingredient
x 0.0027

For example, the quarts per acre of Sonar A.S. required to provide a concentration of 25 ppb of active ingredient in water with an average depth of 5 feet is calculated as follows:

$5 \times 25 \times 0.0027 = 0.33$ quarts per treated surface acre

When measuring quantities of Sonar A.S., quarts may be converted to fluid ounces by multiplying quarts to be measured x 32. For example, $0.33 \text{ quarts} \times 32 = 10.5$ fluid ounces.

Note: Calculated rates should not exceed the maximum allowable rate in quarts per treated surface acre for the water depth listed in the application rate table for the site to be treated.

The following chart outlines rate calculations for DMA – 4 IVM Herbicide. It was taken directly from the DMA – 4 IVM specimen label on Dow AgroSciences website. <http://www.dowagro.com/ivm/invasive/prod/dma.htm>

Submerged Aquatic Weeds: Including Eurasian Water Milfoil (*Myriophyllum spicatum*)

Treatment Site	Maximum Application Rate [†]	Specific Use Directions
Aquatic Weed Control in Ponds, Lakes, Reservoirs, Marshes, Bayous, Drainage Ditches, Canals, Rivers and Streams that are Quiescent or Slow Moving, Including Programs of the Tennessee Valley Authority	2.84 gallons (10.8 lb of acid equivalent) per acre foot	<p>Application Timing: For best results, apply in spring or early summer when aquatic weeds appear. Check for weed growth in areas heavily infested the previous year. A second application may be needed when weeds show signs of recovery, but no later than mid-August in most areas.</p> <p>Subsurface Application: Apply DMA 4 IVM undiluted directly to the water through a boat mounted distribution system. Shoreline areas should be treated by subsurface injection application by boat to avoid aerial drift.</p> <p>Surface Application: Use power operated boat mounted boom sprayer. If rate is less than 5 gallons per acre, dilute to a minimum spray volume of 5 gallons per surface acre.</p> <p>Aerial Application: Use drift control spray equipment or thickening agents mixed with sprays to reduce drift. Apply through standard boom systems in a minimum spray volume of 5 gallons per surface acre. For Microfoil® drift control spray systems, apply DMA 4 IVM in a total spray volume of 12 to 15 gallons per acre.</p> <p>Apply to attain a concentration of 2 to 4 ppm (see table below).</p>

[†]DMA 4 IVM contains 3.8 lb of acid equivalent per gallon of product.

Amount to Apply to Attain a Concentration of 2 to 4 ppm			
Surface Area	Average Depth (ft)	2,4-D Acid Equivalent to Apply (lb/acre)	Amount of DMA 4 IVM to Apply (gal/acre)
1 acre	1	5.4 to 10.8	1.42 to 2.84
	2	10.8 to 21.6	2.84 to 5.68
	3	16.2 to 32.4	4.26 to 8.53
	4	21.6 to 43.2	5.68 to 11.37
	5	27.0 to 54.0	7.10 to 14.21

The following table outlines rate calculations for Renovate 3 herbicide based on desired PPM and average depth of treatment area. It is taken directly from the Renovate 3 specimen label on SePRO Corporation's website: www.sepro.com

Concentration of Triclopyr Acid in Water (ppm ae)					
	Gallons of Renovate 3 per surface acre at specified depth				
Water Depth (feet)	0.75 ppm	1.0 ppm	1.5 ppm	2.0 ppm	2.5 ppm
1	0.7	0.9	1.4	1.8	2.3
2	1.4	1.8	3.3	3.6	4.6
3	2.1	2.9	4.1	5.4	6.8
4	2.7	3.6	5.4	7.2	9.1
5	3.4	4.5	6.8	9.0	11.3
6	4.1	5.4	8.1	10.9	13.6
7	4.8	6.3	9.5	12.7	15.8
8	5.5	7.2	10.9	14.5	18.1
9	6.1	8.1	12.2	16.3	20.4
10	6.8	9.0	13.6	18.1	22.6
15	10.2	13.6	20.4	27.2	33.9
20	13.6	18.1	27.2	36.2	45.3

16.2 Common Aquatic Plants of Indiana

16.3 Pesticide Use Restrictions Summary:

The following table was produced by Purdue University and included in the Professional Aquatic Applicators Training Manual. It gives a summary of water use restrictions on all major chemicals available for use in the aquatics market.

Table 17: Pesticide Use Restrictions

Table 1. Aquatic Herbicides and Their Use Restrictions. Always check the label because these restrictions are subject to change.

	Human			Animal	Irrigation		
	Drinking	Swimming	Fish Consumption	Drinking	Turf	Forage	Food Crops
<i>----- waiting period, in days -----</i>							
Copper Chelate	0	0 ^a	0	0	0	0	0
Copper Sulfate	0	0 ^a	0	0	0	0	0
Diquat	1–3	0 ^a	0	1	1–3	1–3	5
Endothall (granular) ^b	7	0 ^a	3	0	7	7	7
Endothall (liquid) ^b	7–25	0 ^a	3	7–25	7–25 ^d	7–25	7–25
Endothall 191 (granular) ^c	7–25	0 ^a	3	7–25	7–25	7–25	7–25
Endothall 191 (liquid) ^c	7–25	0 ^a	3	7–25	7–25	7–25	7–25
Fluridone	0 ^e	0 ^a	0	0	7–30	7–30	7–30
Glyphosate	0 ^e	0 ^a	0	0	0	0	0
2,4-D (granular)	*	0 ^a	0	*	*	*	*

^aAlthough this compound has no waiting period for swimming, it is always advisable to wait 24 hours before permitting swimming in the direct area of treatment.

^bTrade name is Aquathol®.

^cTrade name is Hydrothol®.

^dMay be used for sprinkling bent grass immediately.

^eDo not apply this product within 1/4 (fluridone) to 1/2 (glyphosate) mile upstream of potable water intakes.

*Do not use treated water for domestic purposes, livestock watering (2,4-D, dairy animals only), or irrigation.

16.4 Resources for Aquatic Management

In addition to the LARE Program, there are many other sources of potential funding to help improve the quality of Indiana Lakes. Many government agencies assist in projects designed to improve environmental quality.

The USDA has many programs to assist environmental improvement. More information on the following programs can be found at www.usda.gov.

Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Program (USDA)

Conservation Reserve Program (USDA)

Wetlands Reserve Program (USDA)

Grassland Reserve Program (USDA)

Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program (USDA)

Small Watershed Rehabilitation Program (USDA)

The following programs are offered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. More information about the Fish and Wildlife service can be found at www.fws.gov

Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)

Bring Back the Natives Program (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)

Native Plant Conservation Program (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)

The Environmental Protection Agency, the Indiana Department of Environmental Management, and the U.S. Forest Service also have numerous programs for funding. A few of these are listed below. More information can be found at www.in.gov/idem and www.fs.fed.us/

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Environmental Education Program (EPA)

NPDES Related State Program Grants (IDEM)

Community Forestry Grant Program (U.S. Forest Service)

16.5 State Regulations for Aquatic Plant Management

The following information is found on the IDNR website and outlines general regulations for the management of aquatic plants in public waters.

AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PERMIT REGULATIONS

Indiana Department of Natural Resources

Note: In addition to a permit from IDNR, public water supplies cannot be treated without prior written approval from the IDEM Drinking Water Section. **Amended state statute adds biological and mechanical control (use of weed harvesters) to the permit requirements, reduces the area allowed for treatment without a permit to 625 sq ft, and updates the reference to IDEM. These changes become effective on July 1, 2002.**

Chapter 9. Regulation of Fishing

IC 14-22-9-10

Sec. 10. (a) This section does not apply to the following:

- (1) A privately owned lake, farm pond, or public or private drainage ditch.
- (2) A landowner or tenant adjacent to public waters or boundary waters of the state, who chemically, mechanically, or physically controls aquatic vegetation in the immediate vicinity of a boat landing or bathing beach on or adjacent to the real property of the landowner or tenant if the following conditions exist:

- (A) The area where vegetation is to be controlled does not exceed:
 - (i) twenty-five (25) feet along the legally established, average, or normal shoreline;
 - (ii) a water depth of six (6) feet; and
 - (iii) a total surface area of six hundred twenty-five (625) square feet.
- (B) Control of vegetation does not occur in a public waterway of the state.

(b) A person may not chemically, mechanically, physically, or biologically control aquatic vegetation in the public waters or boundary waters of the state without a permit issued by the department. All procedures to control aquatic vegetation under this section shall be conducted in accordance with rules adopted by the department under IC 4-22-2.

(c) Upon receipt of an application for a permit to control aquatic vegetation and the payment of a fee of five dollars (\$5), the department may issue a permit to the applicant. However, if the aquatic vegetation proposed to be controlled is present in a public water supply, the department may not, without prior written approval from the department of environmental management, approve a permit for control of the aquatic vegetation.

(d) This section does not do any of the following:

- (1) Act as a bar to a suit or cause of action by a person or governmental agency.
 - (2) Relieve the permittee from liability, rules, restrictions, or permits that may be required of the permittee by any other governmental agency.
 - (3) Affect water pollution control laws (as defined in IC 13-11-2-261) and the rules adopted under water pollution control laws (as defined in IC 13-11-2-261).
- As added by P.L.1-1995, SEC.15. Amended by P.L.1-1996, SEC.64.

312 IAC 9-10-3 Aquatic vegetation control permits

Authority: IC 14-22-2-6; IC 14-22-9-10

Affected: IC 14-22-9-10

Sec. 3. (a) Except as provided under IC 14-22-9-10(a), a person shall obtain a permit under this section before applying a substance to waters of this state to seek aquatic vegetation control.

(b) An application for an aquatic vegetation control permit shall be made on a departmental form and must include the following information:

- (1) The common name of the plants to be controlled.
- (2) The acreage to be treated.
- (3) The maximum depth of the water where plants are to be treated.
- (4) The name and amount of the chemical to be used.

(c) A permit issued under this section is limited to the terms of the application and to conditions imposed on the permit by the department.

(d) Five (5) days before the application of a substance permitted under this section, the permit holder must post clearly, visible signs at the treatment area indicating the substance that will be applied and what precautions should be taken.

(e) A permit issued under this section is void if the waters to be treated are supplied to the public by a private company or governmental agency. (Natural Resources Commission; 312

16.6 Public Questionnaire

Lake Use Survey (16 total) Lake name Little Turkey Lake

Are you a lake property owner? Yes 16 No 0

Are you currently a member of your lake association? Yes 16 No 0

How many years have you been at the lake? 2 or less - 3
2 - 5 years - 5
5-10 years - 4
Over 10 years - 4

How do you use the lake (mark all that apply)

10 Swimming

0 Irrigation

13 Boating

0 Drinking water

14 Fishing

2 Other _____

Do you have aquatic plants at your shoreline in nuisance quantities? Yes 11 No 5

Do you currently participate in a weed control project on the lake? Yes 3 No 10

Does aquatic vegetation interfere with your use or enjoyment of the lake? Yes 12 No 4

Does the level of vegetation in the lake affect your property values? Yes 5 No 3

Are you in favor of continuing efforts to control vegetation on the lake? Yes 15 No 1

Are you aware that the LARE funds will only apply to work controlling invasive exotic species, and more work may need to be privately funded? Yes 14 No 2

Mark any of these you think are problems on your lake:

1 Too many boats access the lake

0 Use of jet skis on the lake

2 Too much fishing

2 Fish population problem

8 Dredging needed

6 Overuse by nonresidents

12 Too many aquatic plants

1 Not enough aquatic plants

7 Poor water quality

0 Pier/funneling problem

Please add any comments:

Currently the lake is very green because there are not
enough weeds to uptake dissolved nutrients;
bass club speeding and ill manners concerning
lake owners' property; lake too small for bass
tournaments that happens once a weekend (mon. or weekend)
No one has room to fish when the bass tournaments
are here. Would like to eliminate them.

16.7 Species Distribution Maps

Figure 10: 2007 Rake Sample Locations




Figure 11: June 2007 Bladderwort Locations



Figure 12: June 2007 Brittle Naiad Locations




Figure 13: JUNE 2007 Chara Locations




Figure 14: June 2007 Coontail Locations




Figure 15: June 2007 Curly Leaf Pondweed Locations




Figure 16: June 2007 Elodea Locations




Figure 17: June 2007 Eurasian Watermilfoil Locations




Figure 18: June 2007 Sago Pondweed Locations




Figure 19: June 2007 Small Pondweed Locations





Figure 20: June 2007 Whorled Watermilfoil Locations



August 2007

Figure 21: August 2007 Bladderwort Locations




Figure 22: August 2007 Brittle Naiad Locations




Figure 23: August 2007 Chara Locations




Figure 24: August 2007 Coontail Locations




Figure 25: August 2007 Curly Leaf Pondweed Locations




Figure 26: August 2007 Elodea Locations




Figure 27: August 2007 Eurasian Watermilfoil Locations




Figure 28: August 2007 Flat-Stemmed Pondweed Locations




Figure 29: August 2007 Illinois Pondweed Locations




Figure 30: August 2007 Sago Pondweed Locations




Figure 31: August 2007 Slender Naiad Locations





Figure 32: August 2007 Small Pondweed Locations



16.8 Data Sheets

Aquatic Vegetation Random Sampling (Tier 2)			
<u>Waterbody Cover Sheet</u>			
Surveying Organization:	Aquatic Weed Control		
Contact Information:	574-533-2597		
Waterbody Name:	Little Turkey	Lake ID:	Little Turkey
County(s):	LaGrange	Date:	6-14-07
Habitat Stratum:	I L	Avg. Lake Depth (ft):	11.5 ft
		Lake Level:	Avg.
Crew Leader:	Dave Keister		
Recorder:	Dave Keister		
GPS Metadata			
Datum:	Zone:	Accuracy:	
NAD83	16	30 ft	
Method:	Wats enabled GPS		
Secchi Depth (ft):	3.2 ft	Total # of Points Surveyed:	50
		Total # of Species:	10
Littoral Zone Size (acres):	70		
<input type="checkbox"/> Measured			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Estimated			
Littoral Zone Max. Depth (ft):	9 ft		
<input type="checkbox"/> Measured			
<input type="checkbox"/> Estimate (historical Secchi)			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Estimated (current Secchi)			
Notable Conditions:	low secchi - 3.2 ft ; eurasian water milfoil common ; coon tail also very common ; water temp 75°-82°		

Submersed Aquatic Vegetation Survey (Tier II) Datasheet

Page 1 of 3

WATERBODY NAME: Little Turkey Lake					DATE: June 14, 2007											
COUNTY: LaGrange					SECCHI DEPTH (FT): 3.2 feet											
SITE ID: Little Turkey					MAX PLANT DEPTH (FT): 15-sample → actual → 9 ft											
SURVEYING ORGANIZATION: Aquatic Weed Control					WEATHER: Sunny, Calm, hot - Temp 86°											
CREW LEADER: Dave Keister					COMMENTS (include voucher codes - V1, V2...): 23 8-5											
RECORDER: Dave Keister					Water Temp 75° - 82° 17 5-10 10 10-15											
CONTACT INFO: 574-533-2597					Rake score (1, 3, 5). 9 = algae, emergent or species observed but not sampled.											
Point #	R/T	Latitude	Longitude	Depth	Species Codes: fago elodea curly Brille Small Whorls								Notes			
					Myriophyllum	Ceratophyllum	Sagittaria	Elodea	Potamogeton	Chara	Najas	Potamogeton		Potamogeton		
1	R	GPS Waypoints		3	3	3	3	3	1							
2				4	1	3	1									
3				2	1	1	3			5						P
4				5		3	1			1						
5				2						1						
6				3			3			1						
7				6	1	3	3			1						
8				3	1											P
9				3												
10				2						3						
11				3			3									
12				4	1	3	1			1						
13				4		1										
14				6						1						
15				4	1	3					1					
16				4	-					1						
17				6	1	3										P
18				5	-											
19				4	3	3										P
20				6	5	3										
21				5	1		1									
22				3						1			1			P
23				3						1						
24				4		3	1			5						
25				3		5				3						
26				4		3				1						
27				5											1	
28				15	-											
29				9		1										
30				14	-											
31				6	3	3										
32				8	-											
Other plant species observed at lake:																

Submersed Aquatic Vegetation Survey (Tier II) Datasheet

Page 2 of 3

WATERBODY NAME: Little Turkey Lake				DATE: June 14 2007										
COUNTY: Lagrange County				SECCHI DEPTH (FT): 3.2 feet										
SITE ID: Little Turkey				MAX PLANT DEPTH (FT): ~9 feet										
SURVEYING ORGANIZATION: Aquatic Weed Control				WEATHER: Sunny Hot Calm										
CREW LEADER: Dave Heister				COMMENTS (Include voucher codes - V1, V2...):										
RECORDER: Dave Heister				water temp 75-82										
CONTACT INFO: 574 533 2597				Rake score (1, 3, 5). 9 = algae, emergent or species observed but not sampled.										
Point #	R/T	Latitude	Longitude	Depth	Myriophyllum	Ceratophyllum	Sagittaria	Elodea	Potamogeton	Chara	Najas	Potamogeton	Other	Notes
33	R			7	3	3	1							
34	↓			15	-									
35				7	-									
36	↓			11	-									
37				8	-									
38				15	-									
39				7	-									
40				7	1		1							
41				8	1					1				
42				15	-									
43				12	-									
44				7		3				1	1			
45				15	-									
46				15	-									
47				14	-									
48				6	1	1				1				1
49				7	1	5	1							
50				7	3									

Other plant species observed at lake:

10-15
174
5

5-16

3 5-10

Aquatic Weed Control

Aquatic Vegetation Random Sampling (Tier 2)

Waterbody Cover Sheet

Surveying Organization: Aquatic Weed Control

Contact Information: 574-533-2597

Waterbody Name: Little Turkey Lake Lake ID: Little Turkey

County(s): LaGrange, IN Date: August 1, 2007

Habitat Stratum: IL Avg. Lake Depth (ft): 11.5 feet Lake Level: Aug

GPS Metadata

Crew Leader: Dave Keister Datum: NAD83 Zone: 16 Accuracy: 30 ft

Recorder: Dave Keister Method: WAAS enabled GPS

Secchi Depth (ft): 3.2 Total # of Points Surveyed: 50 Total # of Species: 11

Littoral Zone Size (acres): 70 Littoral Zone Max. Depth (ft): 9 ft

☐ Measured ☒ Estimated

☐ Measured ☐ Estimate (historical Secchi) ☒ Estimated (current Secchi)

Notable Conditions:

Secchi depth unchanged from spring survey
Brittle naiad much more abundant
Coontail was the most abundant plant

Submersed Aquatic Vegetation Survey (Tier II) Datasheet

Page 1 of 2

WATERBODY NAME: Little Turkey Lake				DATE: August 1, 2007			
COUNTY: LaGrange				SECCHI DEPTH (FT): 3.2			
SITE ID: Little Turkey				MAX PLANT DEPTH (FT): 8 feet			
SURVEYING ORGANIZATION: Aquatic Weed Control				WEATHER: Hot - Sunny - Temp mid 90's			
CREW LEADER: Dave Keister				COMMENTS (include voucher codes - V1, V2...):			
RECORDER: Dave Keister							
CONTACT INFO: 574-533-2597				Rake score (1, 3, 5). 9 = algae, emergent or species observed but not sampled.			
Point #	R/T	Latitude	Longitude	Depth	Species Codes	Notes	
→ R	Waypoints						
1				3	5		
2				4	1	3	
3				2		3	
4				5	3	1	3
5				2	1		1
6				3		3	
7				6	5	1	
8				3	1	5	
9				3	1	1	1
10				2		1	1
11				3	-		1
12				4		1	1
13				4		1	3
14				6		1	1
15				4	5	3	
16				4		1	
17				6	-		
18				5	1	1	
19				4	5	3	1
20				6	3	5	1
21				5		3	1
22				3			3
23				3	1	1	3
24				4	5	1	1
25				3	5	1	
26				4	3		
27				5			3
28				15	-		
29				9	-		
30				14	-		
31				6		1	5
32				8	-		
33				7	3	1	3

Other plant species observed at lake:

curly-1
slender-1slender-3
bladder-3P
P

Submersed Aquatic Vegetation Survey (Tier II) Datasheet

Page 2 of 2

WATERBODY NAME: Little Turkey Lake				DATE: August 2, 2007				
COUNTY: La Grange				SECCHI DEPTH (FT): 2.2				
SITE ID: Little Turkey				MAX PLANT DEPTH (FT): 8 feet				
SURVEYING ORGANIZATION: Aquatic Weed Control				WEATHER: Part - Sunny				
CREW LEADER: Dave Keister				COMMENTS (include voucher codes - V1, V2...):				
RECORDER: Dave Keister								
CONTACT INFO:				Rake score (1, 3, 5). 9 = algae, emergent or species observed but not sampled.				
Point #	R/T	Latitude	Site Longitude	Depth	Species Codes: ^{copy} Ev Sagd	Biote	Flor	Alb
					Cerdm	MLRpi	Stuget	NAGmin
					POTII	Chora	POTZOS	Notes
→	R	Waypoints	34	15	-			
			35	7	-			
			36	11	-			
			37	8	-			
			38	15	-			
			39	7	-			
			40	7			3	
			41	9		1	5	1
			42	15	-			
			43	12	-			
			44	7	-			
			45	15	-			
			46	15	-			
			47	14	-			
			48	6		1	1	3
			49	7	5			1
			50	7	3			
Other plant species observed at lake:								

Rake Sample GPS Coordinates

Latitude	Longitude	Site
41.593397	-85.215295	1
41.594714	-85.212989	2
41.59518	-85.214548	3
41.597199	-85.213688	4
41.598077	-85.214926	5
41.599371	-85.214503	6
41.598585	-85.21246	7
41.599715	-85.213065	8
41.599876	-85.215247	9
41.600548	-85.216444	10
41.599804	-85.217815	11
41.599066	-85.218259	12
41.59847	-85.219222	13
41.601173	-85.218893	14
41.601149	-85.221353	15
41.599519	-85.220163	16
41.598441	-85.221439	17
41.598993	-85.223044	18
41.598818	-85.224703	19
41.59813	-85.22613	20
41.597006	-85.22216	21
41.595639	-85.221534	22
41.594844	-85.220141	23
41.593959	-85.219403	24
41.594024	-85.21753	25
41.594613	-85.21592	26
41.595592	-85.215949	27
41.595054	-85.216527	28
41.596647	-85.216299	29
41.598009	-85.216225	30
41.598834	-85.216047	31
41.598558	-85.213519	32
41.599429	-85.216722	33
41.598371	-85.217758	34
41.600122	-85.219409	35
41.598948	-85.220552	36
41.598531	-85.223303	37
41.598164	-85.224618	38
41.596773	-85.22123	39
41.596277	-85.221643	40
41.595255	-85.221203	41
41.595204	-85.220772	42
41.59442	-85.219194	43
41.593959	-85.218747	44
41.594472	-85.218229	45
41.597563	-85.216262	46
41.598642	-85.217145	47

41.595968	-85.214382	48
41.594177	-85.215813	49
41.593835	-85.214786	50

16.9 IDNR Vegetation Control Permit

To be included in the final report.